

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein. Claims 1-3, 12-13, 15-20 have been amended.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-10, 12, and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kerho et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,924,442) in view of C.D. Paulsell, P.E., "The Use Of Exponential Dilution Flow In Gas Analyzer Calibrations," U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Ann Arbor, MI 48105.

With regard to claim 1, Examiner admits that Kerho discloses supplying **either** a span gas **or** a non-reactive zero gas. Therefore, Kerho does not show, teach, or suggest varying at least one of a third concentration of the non-reactive zero gas and a fourth concentration of the span gas in a calibration mixture as a function of time, wherein at least one of the third concentration and fourth concentration are varied at a rate that is slower than a decay rate of said calibration mixture.

Paulsell fails to cure the deficient teachings of Kerho. As best understood by Applicants, Paulsell discusses exponential dilution. Exponential dilution is derived from a characteristic that occurs when a span gas is suddenly switched to a non-reactive zero gas. Switching from the span gas to the non-reactive zero gas causes the span gas concentration to exponentially decay to zero at a decay rate. Applicants can find no mention of varying at least one of a third concentration of the non-reactive zero gas and a fourth concentration of the span gas in a calibration mixture as a function of time,

wherein at least one of the third concentration and fourth concentration are varied at a rate that is slower than a decay rate of said calibration mixture.

Claim 17 is allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 2, 11, 13, 14, and 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have previously presented a new independent claim 21 that incorporates the elements of claims 1, 3, and 11.

Furthermore, Applicants have rewritten claims 2, 13, and 20 in independent format. Claims 3-12, 15-16; 14; and 18-19 each ultimately depend on amended claims 2, 13, and 20, respectively, and are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (313) 665-4969.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 7, 2006

By: *Michael D. Wiggins*
Michael D. Wiggins
Reg. No. 34,754

GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION
Legal Staff, Mail Code 482-C23-B21
P.O. Box 300
Detroit, MI 48265-3000